

Landerdale Lake, near
Elkhorn Wis

Aug

My dear Doctor Watson

The proofs would
have received more prompt attention, but
I have been suffering from a neuralgia
for several days past (ever since your
letter was rec^d), which ^{has} utterly incapacitated
me for any work of the kind. I am
much more comfortable this morning -
Away from books, notes, herbarium & I find
it much more embarrassing to add a
line or two that will fit in and be of
like character with the rest than to cut
out a line here and there -

A defect in my analysis of the species
strikes me now for the first time and
I hope it is not too late to make the
desired correction. At the risk of being
tedious I will adopt the style of my
former letter and explain in extended
so that you may fully understand me.
The diandrous species I intended to
divide at "one fell swoop" by "Capsulus
omentosus" & "Capsulus glabrous". This

may not be very scientific - but
with our species it is wonderfully
convenient - the character is constant -
and the separation by it preserves rather
than interferes with natural affinities.
Besides it is easily observed by the ordinary
student - Very well - Now I next had in
mind to separate the "* Capsules tomentum"
into two divisions

1' long pedicels - short styles

2' short pedicels - long styles.

But partly I think on account of *S. sericea*
the pedicels of which can not be called
long - I seem to have made practically
three coequal sections viz

* Capsules tomentum - style short &c

* * Capsules tomentum style elongated

* * Capsules glabrous:

the two latter (see page 484) being
each marked by two asterisks; which
is confusing -

I have partially (in my own imper-
fect way) indicated the change which
I would like made but will repeat
here hoping that you will make the
matter plain to the printer

Under * Capsulis Tomentosa p 482
insert a line as follows

+ Pedicels 3-6 times the length of the gland; style medium
or none.

and change the alternative on p 484 to

+ + Pedicels twice the length of the gland; style
elongated.

I would gladly avoid if possible this
technical measure of the length of the
pedicel by the use of some general term
but do not see how I can do so.
Drawing broad, dark lines (for the sake
of authenticity) which are not sustained
by nature is something not just to my
liking - and S. sericea stands in the
way of saying pedicels long - On the
other hand as given there is a strict
adherence to the facts in the case -
and ^{at the same time} the general idea conveyed that the
pedicels are longer in one section than in
the other - In actual use there will be
no confusion since S. sericea with its rather
short pedicel has markedly a sessile
stigma - So too, ~~and~~ after reflection I

substitute style medium for "style short". because in P. humilis and in some forms of S. discolor, primordials the style can scarcely be called short.

This gives the desired line on p 482 but simply changes a line on ~~p~~ p 484. May now - having stricken out "pedicel twice as long as the glans" from both S. candida and P. phyllizolia (as useful when the character is given in the analysis) it leaves I suppose two or three lines to be added to either p 484 or 483.

I might say of S. adnophylla

This species is most nearly allied to the Clavatae ~~but~~ but connects that group with the Cordatae.

This would make nearly two lines - If more is desired, how would it do to remark of Dudley's S. mucosa x cordata

A hybrid with S. mucosa (surprising on account of the scarcity of the introduced parent) is found at Ithaca, N. Y. (Dudley).

Or if you do not relish this sort of irrelevant remark in connection with other matter evidenced to the last

degree, you can, in desperation, restore
S. cordata or vestita - though I prefer on the
whole to omit it.

I really am in no condition to
think and must throw myself almost
wholly upon your indulgence to
exercise a critical judgment in my
behalf.

The change in the subdivision of
the diandrous species under the section
Capulus tomentosus - I think is a
good one - and trust it may be
commenced truly to good, On the proof
will you please carry out more
definitely the necessary changes of
+ ++ = &c -

Yours cordially,
W. S. Webb

A citation of Darlington *H. Cestrici*, ed. 3, after
S. cordata or *myricoides* Darb. Fl. Cist. ed. 3
S. myricoides, Muhl., might be only, just, as
here for the first time the character of
Muhlenberg's plant was rightly apprehended.
This would perhaps be a better use of the
line at my disposal - than expanding the

reference to *Sarracenia cordata* - As this
 description stands the addition of a ^{few} ~~single~~
words will add a line - I have always
 admired the old Doctors' fidelity, for
 refusing in this instance the clerk
 his description to make a coincidence
 with Carey. The plant he had in
 view he doubtless ascertained to be
 the genuine *S. angustifolia* by a direct
 comparison with the type specimens -
 When I say I felt apprehended Muhlberg's
 plant, I do not mean that Dr Darlington
 recognized its typical character - but
 he certainly first recognized the
 fact that it was something other
 than a variety of *cordata* and
 the plant he referred to *Sarracenia*
 was identical with Muhlberg's -